

The Classical Weekly

VOL. IX

SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1916

No. 20

PERIODICAL RECEIVED
MAF 20/1916

UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

Columbia University Press

Books on Classical Literature and Philology

FOUR STAGES OF GREEK RELIGION. By GILBERT MURRAY, Regius Professor of Greek in Oxford University. 8vo, cloth, pp. 223. Price, \$1.50 net.

GREEK LITERATURE. A series of ten lectures delivered at Columbia University by scholars from various universities. 8vo, cloth, pp. vii + 306. Price, \$2.00 net.

GREEK ROMANCES IN ELIZABETHAN PROSE FICTION. By SAMUEL LEE WOLFF, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. ix + 529. Price, \$2.00 net.

CLASSICAL STUDIES IN HONOUR OF HENRY DRISLER. 8vo, cloth, pp. ix + 310. Portrait and other illustrations. Price, \$2.00 net.

THE CLASSICAL PAPERS OF MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE. With a memoir. 8vo, cloth. Portrait and plates. Pp. xxx + 300. Price, \$3.00 net.

Columbia University Studies in Classical Philology

THE SATIRE OF SENECA ON THE APOTHEOSIS OF CLAUDIUS, COMMONLY CALLED THE ΑΠΟΚΟΛΟΥΘΩΣΙΣ. A Study. By ALLEN PERLEY BALL, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. vii + 256. Price, \$1.25 net.

STRESS ACCENT IN LATIN POETRY. By ELIZABETH HICKMAN DU BOIS, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. v + 96. Price, \$1.25 net.

STUDIES IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL TERMINOLOGY OF LUCRETIUS AND CICERO. By KATHARINE C. REILEY, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. ix + 133. Price, \$1.25 net.

COSTUME IN ROMAN COMEDY. By CATHARINE SAUNDERS, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. x + 145. Price, \$1.25 net.

DE INFINITIVI FINALIS VEL CONSECUTIVI CONSTRUCTIONE APUD PRISCOS POETAS GRAECOS. By CHARLES JONES OGDEN, Ph.D. 8vo, cloth, pp. 60. Price, \$1.00 net.

THE BELLUM CIVILE OF PETRONIUS. By FLORENCE T. BALDWIN, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. viii + 264. Price, \$1.25 net.

RELIGIOUS CULTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AMAZONS. By FLORENCE MARY BENNETT, Ph.D. 8vo, pp. ix + 79. Price, cloth, \$1.25 net; paper, \$1.00 net.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

LEMCKE & BUECHNER, Agents

30-32 West 27th St.

NEW YORK

LIVE TOPICS IN LATIN TEACHING

AS long as Latin teachers work to secure deeper appreciation of the classics, *sight reading* will be a live subject. There exists a healthy disagreement as to the best way to direct this work. Some hold that previous preparation is necessary. Others feel that *sight reading* is best done without it. Perhaps you feel strongly about this point. In view of the relative claims to excellence of both plans, might it not be worth your while to make an analysis of class methods? Watch the work of your "average student". Is he guessing at the meaning and ignoring constructions? Or is he reading slowly, thoughtfully, taking each word as it comes, getting the Latin context before translating? Whatever he does is a matter of habit. How can he be led to form *good habits*? Hiram H. Bice, of the Brooklyn Polytechnic Preparatory School, has answered this question for himself and for anyone else who wishes to use "SIGHT READING IN LATIN", published by GINN AND COMPANY. In it are about one hundred excellent exercises which may be used in whatever way the teacher desires. Material for preparation is suggested at the first of each lesson, or the reading may be done without preparation. Why not experiment with it? Your students will agreeably surprise you.—"The Friend of the Average Student".

FOR ENTRANCE TO COLLEGE

Mitchell's Writing of Narrative Latin - - - **\$1.10**

By BENJAMIN W. MITCHELL, Ph.D., Professor of Latin and Head of Department of Ancient and Modern Languages, Central High School, Philadelphia.

THIS course, which is based mainly on the First Book of Caesar's Gallic War, provides the pupil with a thorough drill in concrete writing, and teaches him to think and reason. It makes him realize that the best way to arrive at the Latin equivalent for the given English idea is by canvassing English synonyms. In this way it develops resourcefulness, the one quality most often found lacking in the beginner's attempt to write Latin. In this connection the lesson vocabularies are unusually helpful, giving innumerable hints to explain the exact meaning of the English words and the peculiar use and construction of their Latin equivalents. The work covers the entire course of college preparation in Latin composition.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. IX

NEW YORK, MARCH 18, 1916

No. 20

In the University Journal of the University of Nebraska, for December, 1914 (pages 25-26), Dr. H. B. Alexander, some of whose utterances on the Classics were given in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7.33-35, had A Letter to Students.

Since what Dr. Alexander said is even more true now, part of his letter is here reproduced:

And what does this war mean for the intellect of the world? France, England and Germany have carried this earth's intellectual burdens and achieved its intellectual triumphs for the past five centuries. The training of a mind is not accomplished in a day; its gifts to society are the slow labor of years. Can anyone doubt that, whatever the outcome of the present war in a political way, its effects upon the trained minds of Western Europe can only be disastrous? The higher works of peace, when peace is restored, will suffer more terribly than all else. Science, scholarship, literature, art, these must give way to the more pressing needs of political and economic and social reconstruction; the machine must be rebuilt before its product can be manufactured, the garden must be regrown before its fruits can be forthcoming. Partly this will be due to economic stress, for mental achievement is only possible in well-provisioned societies; partly it will be due to actual loss of trained minds, the young men of university training whose lives are lost or maimed, the gifted children to whom education must be denied, the many hundreds of men whose nervous and mental strength will be permanently weakened by the stress of war; and in part it will be due to the fact that Europe will require all its surviving intellectual powers to repair its immediate ills. France, exhausted by the Napoleonic wars, required the long lethargy of the reign of Louis Philippe to regain partially its lost spiritual energy. Can any man think that the present war will not be far more deadly to the spirit of modern Europe?

And in view of this, what is our part? America is ill-prepared to become the bearer of the light of culture; it is to no trained runner that the torch is cast. Yet it is obvious that the race is to us. For the next generation, perhaps for the next century, or five centuries, we must stand in the forefront of progress, performing a great, if not the greater, share of the world's mental labors—if the work is to be performed at all. It would be the idlest of conceits for us to suppose that we can succeed in such task without the most intense and serious effort; we are as yet far from the van of progress, and must achieve what the other nations are losing before we can pass them; the immediate future of the world, despite our best, is certain to be a period of retrogression; nevertheless, if we persist, we may hope eventually to save the loss, and better it with gain. In any case the duty of effort is clear.

But what is the first step?

It is one the students must take—a step for our youth. I have already said that the training of minds is slow. It is the slowest of all work in those fields which require long and impersonal effort; for work in science and scholarship and the patient analysis of history. Without work of this character, civilization must perish; hitherto, we have borrowed its fruits from generous fatherlands; now we must mature them by our own toils.

I wish . . . to indicate one great gap in our national preparation for the task that is ours—as I think, the greatest gap. More than any other great folk we are in need of men and women with a clear sense of the sources and promptings of our civilization, with a developed historical sense, in its richest meaning. What differentiates civilized men from the savage is the civilized man's knowledge of his own history; such knowledge is the only sure anchor of culture. We cannot know ourselves until we know the past not only of those who were our physical fathers, but above all of those peoples who have given us our spiritual heritage. This is no light or easy study. It calls for knowledge of languages, ancient and modern; it calls for devotion to political, economic and social history, and to the logical analysis of fact; it calls for familiarity with the literatures, arts and philosophies of western peoples, from Greek and Hebrew to the English and German; and it calls for a power of effective use of this knowledge. Not all is open to one student, though he give a lifetime to the field; but if many students, from many angles, give earnest effort to this central task of preserving as living thought the hard-earned experience of generations, then indeed we may be certain that, whether America's addition to the world's culture be great or little, it will yet have won the gratitude of future generations, by preserving, in time of threatening darkness, man's most precious wisdom.

C. K.

WHERE THE LATIN GRAMMAR FAILS

It may be questioned seriously whether it is good policy to base instruction in Latin grammar almost wholly on the Latin text which the class is reading. But it is through this process of dissecting the reading lesson that teachers usually accomplish the major part of the grammatical drill, reserving comparatively little time for practice in translating English into Latin.

The fact that this is the conventional method of teaching Latin grammar may have insensibly influenced the makers of the standard School Grammars; but, however this may be, it is certainly true that the statements in these Grammars are often drawn with a view primarily to the elucidation of a Latin text,

with little regard for the needs of the student who is trying to learn how to *write* Latin.

Theoretically, of course, the rules of the Grammar should work as well one way as the other; but this is not always the case. Theoretically, too, when the rule of the Grammar does not meet the need of the student who is learning to *write*, the maker of the Composition book should intervene, and work over the rule into a form suited to the purpose in hand; but most makers of Composition books are rather chary of straying far from the orthodoxy of the Grammar.

The justice of these remarks will be more evident if concrete examples are presented; and attention is therefore invited, first, to the time-honored statement: 'verbs signifying to favor, help, please, trust, etc. take the dative'. As a preliminary to further discussion, it should perhaps be noted that, even from the point of view of elucidating a Latin text, this is a rather weak rule. Regularly it is followed by a statement that the Latin verbs in question do not really signify 'favor, help, please, trust, etc.', but that *servio*, for example, means 'be in bondage', *noceo*, 'be injurious', etc. This added statement is essential, as providing an explanation of the case use; but, at the same time, it gives the lie direct to the rule itself. For it is not, for example, the verb signifying 'injure' that takes the dative, but the verb that means 'be injurious'.

Having involved itself in this tangle, the Grammar next must needs add a warning that perfectly regular verbs like *iuvō* and *laedo* are 'exceptions' to the rule just branded as false. And it is only at the very end, buried perhaps in the small print of a footnote, that those who persevere find the center and core of the whole matter embodied in a list of *Latin* verbs which govern the dative, but which are usually so translated into English that their intransitive nature is obscured, e.g. *credo*, *faveo*, *fido*, *ignosco*, etc. Here at length we emerge upon solid ground; but one wonders how many students pursue the investigation thus far. The chances are that the majority find that their energies are exhausted in mastering the cadences of the misstatement of the original rule—'favor, help, please, trust, envy, threaten, pardon, spare'.

With even such a small stock of misinformation, a student may get on fairly well in the Caesar or the Cicero class; if he meets in the text *opitulor* with its dative, he has but to murmur 'favor, help, please, trust'; if, a little farther down on the page, he encounters *adiuvo* with the accusative, his attention is not likely to be arrested, if the teacher is discreetly silent.

But when the Composition class is called, a very different situation develops. With only a fragment of the original rule—shorn of all its props and qualifications—in his head, the pupil is all at sea when called on to handle a clause containing such a common English verb as 'hep' or 'aid'. Ask a freshman class (after four years of High School training) what verbs of 'aiding' they know; usually *iuvō* is first mentioned;

then perhaps someone will think of *adiuvo*. At this point there is a full stop. If it is then asked what case *adiuvo* governs, the bolder spirits are inclined to venture dative—is it not a verb of 'helping' and is it not compounded with *ad*? The class seems almost aggrieved when told that *adiuvo* can govern only the accusative. Nor is good feeling restored by the writing on the board of a list of verbs of 'helping', so-called, that do govern the dative, e.g. *auxilior*, *opitulor*, *subvenio* and *succurro*. The students shake their heads, and even say that they never saw those words before.

In Latin Composition, it seems clear, this subject must be approached from a point of view exactly opposite to that taken by the Grammars, i.e. the student must begin by learning a list of *Latin* verbs whose intransitive nature is obscured by our ordinary English renderings. In fact this would cover the whole case; for verbs like *iuvō* and *laedo* would not enter the discussion at all.

This plan, proposed some years ago¹, is finding favor in some of the newer manuals on Latin Composition. It would simplify matters much if the Grammars should follow suit; and from every point of view it would be to their interest to do so. For the statement they now offer is an illogical patchwork of a number of complicated items, whereas the Composition rule proposed is scientific and simple—it puts the dative with special verbs on an equal footing with the ablative with special verbs. And as for the memory work involved, it is certainly no more difficult to memorize a list of fifteen or twenty Latin words than it is to master an equally long list of English mistranslations, and to keep in mind several important 'exceptions'.

Another Grammar rule that hinders rather than helps the student of Composition is the one that treats the dative with verbs compounded with *ad*, *ante*, *con*, *in*, *inter*, etc. This rule is on a more stable foundation than the one just treated, because it is based on the *form* of certain Latin words rather than upon an interpretation of their meaning. Moreover it requires but one qualification, albeit an important one, namely, that it applies only to 'some verbs' or 'many verbs' compounded with the prepositions mentioned in the list.

From the point of view of elucidating a Latin text this rule too does not work badly, because it need never be called up unless it is illustrated by the text. But the Composition class quite forgets the important qualification that the rule holds merely for some verbs or many verbs, and feels quite virtuous if only it can repeat the list of prepositions. It would doubtless cause a mild sensation in some Composition classes if the teacher should read from the Gildersleeve-Lodge Grammar, § 331, the list of prepositions found in compounds that govern the *accusative*: *ad*, *ante*, *circum*, *con*, *in*, *inter*, *ob*, *per*, *praeter*, *sub*, *subter*, *super*, *trans*.

¹See *The Classical Journal*, 2, 250 ff.

The difficulty at this point is rendered acute by the fact that many of the compounds governing the accusative are very common: compare e.g. adorior, adeo, aggredior, convenio, invenio, interficio, oppugno, obsideo, subsequor, etc. Indeed, up to a certain point, the more conscientious the student of Composition is, the greater seems to be his liability to error here. Unfortunately the list of compound verbs governing the dative is too long to be incorporated in a Grammar rule; otherwise this difficulty might be handled in the same way as the one first considered. It would help somewhat toward clearing up the situation if the Grammars should print side by side the rule for compounds governing the dative and the rule for compounds governing the accusative. With this arrangement, a careful student could hardly fail to see that the mere fact of composition with certain prepositions is not a decisive test of case use, and that, when he is translating from English into Latin, he must judge each compound on its own merits².

A third point at which study of the Grammars leaves the student in a very confused state of mind is found in the matter of relative clauses of characteristic. Approaching this subject with the idea of elucidating a Latin text, the maker of a Grammar naturally begins with the statement of a general principle, as, for example:

A relative clause used to express a quality or characteristic of a general or indefinite antecedent is called a Clause of Characteristic, and usually stands in the subjunctive.

Then follows a consideration of specific details. But experience with successive classes of College Freshmen seems to show that the attention of the High School pupil is caught by the leading statement (as being most important), and that little attention is given to what follows it.

Hence there is the greatest confusion in the Composition class. From the one general statement few students have gained any clear idea as to what a clause of characteristic really is; and practically everyone has forgotten that the rule states merely that the mood in a relative clause of characteristic is *usually* the subjunctive. The result is that some classes develop almost a mania for writing the subjunctive in relative clauses.

It is not altogether clear what help the Grammars might give by a revision of the conventional statement. But, leaving this question pending, the individual teacher can do much to encourage a saner use of moods in *qui*-clauses in the writing of his Composition class. The simplest plan, perhaps, is to require the pupils to memorize a list of the commonest concrete types of *qui*-clause in which they are to write the subjunctive.

²On the dative with compound verbs, see E. B. Lease, *The Dative with Prepositional Compounds*, *American Journal of Philology*, 33, 285-300; E. B. Lease, *Prepositional Compounds with the Dative in High-School Latin and the First Year in College*, *The Classical Journal*, 8.7-16; B. M. Allen, *The Dative with Compound Verb in Latin*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5, 170-173. C. K.

Such a list can be made without even mentioning the word 'characteristic'; e.g.

- (1) Clauses of Purpose.
- (2) Clauses of Tendency or Result³.
- (3) Causal and Concessive Clauses.
- (4) Clauses dependent upon general expressions of existence and non-existence (*sunt qui*, *nemo est qui*, etc.).

The chief advantage in dealing with the matter in this way is that the class is called upon to handle only concrete and more or less familiar distinctions, for, as noted above, it is not necessary even to point out that some of the classes fall under the head of 'characteristic'.

If, now, the class is instructed to write the subjunctive in relative clauses only when they can be brought under the headings named in the list given by the teacher, as set forth above, a great improvement will at once appear in the Composition work. But, even if the pupils follow directions closely, it is interesting to observe that the usage of the class will fall far short of the restraint which an author like Cicero shows in the use of the subjunctive in relative clauses. Note the indicative in the following passages:

Neque enim potest exercitum is continere imperator, qui se ipse non continent, neque severus esse in iudicando, qui alios in se severos esse iudices non volt (Pomp. 38).

Etenim si is, qui non defendit iniuriam. . . . cum potest, iniuste facit. . . . qualis habendus est is, qui non modo non repellit, sed etiam adiuvat iniuriam? (De Off. 3.74).

In regard to relative clauses, it is the problem of the Composition teacher to secure at least a measure of recognition for the indicative mood. The procedure suggested above is of course little more than a rule of thumb; but it helps much to the desired end.

Once again, and finally, the Grammars serve very poorly the needs of the Composition class in their treatment of certain clauses introduced by the conjunction *cum*. Causal and concessive clauses so introduced of course cause no trouble, nor do temporal *cum*-clauses of the present and the future cause distress. But the light which the Grammars shed on temporal and circumstantial *cum*-clauses of the past is mostly darkness, so far as the students of Composition are concerned; here, again, the more painstaking a pupil is, the more liable he seems—up to a certain point—to be misled by what he remembers of the statement in the Grammar.

To secure some definite facts and figures, the three following English sentences were submitted to a College class of 32 members. They were directed to translate them into Latin, using *cum* in each case as the rendering for 'when':

- (1) When they saw Caesar coming to their aid, they rushed fiercely upon the enemy.

³For example, see Cicero, Cat. 3. 25, where *eius modi*, *quae*, *peripherent* is closely followed by *eius modi*. . . . *ut non*. . . . *diuidicatae sint*.

(2) When they were on the march, they never stopped to collect grain.
 (3) When I was driving Catiline into exile, I saw that all bad citizens would blame me (cf. Cicero Cat. 3.3).

In the first of these sentences the causal shading, of course, calls for the subjunctive; the repeated action of the second demands the indicative; and the third is modeled on a sentence in which Cicero himself uses the indicative—therefore purely temporal, according to the Grammars. The students subjected to this test were enrolled in a Freshman class presupposing at least four years of High School training. The results were not very different from what they would have been if the choice of mood had been left to blind chance, namely:

Four of the 32 students solved the problem (subjunctive in 1, indicative in 2 and 3).

Four misjudged every sentence, writing the indicative in 1, and the subjunctive in 2 and 3.

Three used the subjunctive in 1 and 3, with the indicative in 2.

Three just reversed this, with the indicative in 1 and 3, and the subjunctive in 2.

Six wrote the subjunctive in all three sentences.

Three wrote the indicative in all three sentences.

Nine showed other combinations, all different from the above.

Summarized by sentences, the results were:

	Sentence 1	Sentence 2	Sentence 3
Indicative	14	13	16
Subjunctive	16 ¹	15	14

The test was given wholly unannounced; and the result makes it all too clear that teachers are simply beating the air in trying to teach certain *cum*-constructions on the basis of the rules laid down in most School Grammars. For the class was a representative one, drawn from a large number of Schools, and recruited from people ambitious enough to continue the study of Latin in College.

That careful preparation may make matters even worse would seem to be shown by the following test. In a matriculation examination for which students had presumably made more or less careful and recent preparation, the following sentence was set for translation into Latin:

When the soldiers heard this, they advanced rapidly, so that the enemy would not think that the army of the Roman people wanted to avoid danger.

It might seem that the causal relation here underlying was sufficiently obvious to catch the student's attention. Yet on the 32 papers which showed a clear choice of mood, the indicative was used 20 times, the subjunctive only 12 times.

The difficulty encountered by Composition classes in handling this subject seems to be due to two causes. In the first place, the terms 'circumstantial' and 'tem-

poral' are used by the Grammars to mark a distinction which most students find it hard to grasp, and still harder to remember. If any teacher doubts this, let him put before his class in an offhand way the following sentence:

When the news of victory arrived, there was great rejoicing in the city.

If the class is like most of those known to the writer, the majority of the students will say without hesitation that the subordinate clause is temporal, and that its verb, therefore, should stand in the indicative.

In the second place, the statements usually found in the Grammars are themselves inexact, the authors being misled and prejudiced by general theories as to the historic development of the *cum*-construction. These theories are, of course, important and interesting. Thus we learn that, in early Latin, *cum* everywhere is construed with the indicative, and that the subjunctive first begins to make an inroad into the causal and concessive *cum*-clauses of Terence. Thereafter the use of the subjunctive spread rapidly, its conquests perhaps being due largely to the influence of the somewhat parallel use of the mood in relative clauses of characteristic.

On the basis of this theory, the Grammars lay down the general principle that the subjunctive is used in all causal, concessive, and 'circumstantial' *cum*-clauses, assigning to the indicative all the purely temporal *cum*-clauses. Satisfactory as this distinction may appear in the abstract, any reader who opens his Caesar or his Cicero with unprejudiced mind will see at once that the rule does not hold for these authors. For in their writings the subjunctive has penetrated still farther into the *cum*-construction, appearing with great frequency in clauses that surely are purely temporal. For example, no one without a theory to uphold would think of finding anything but verbal variety in the interchange of stock phrases like *quo cum venisset* and *eo ubi venit*.

What of specific instances like the following?

Cum dies hibernorum complures transissent, . . . subito per exploratores certior factus est . . . omnis noctu discessisse (Caesar, B.G. 3.2).

Litterae. . . integris signis praetoribus traduntur; ipsi comprehensi ad me, cum iam dilucesceret, deducuntur (Cicero, Cat. 3.6).

Confronted with this second sentence, a bright student remarked in perfect good faith: "I should think that Cicero ought to have written the indicative there".

The farther this matter is followed up, the clearer it becomes that the Grammars are exploiting a theory at the expense of the facts. Thus, in his Syntax of High School Latin, Mr. Byrne follows the old-fashioned triple division of *cum*-clauses, i.e. causal, concessive, and temporal, making no attempt to subdivide the last named group into circumstantial and purely temporal. For Caesar, the figures for this circumstantial-temporal group are:

¹The total for each sentence falls short of 32 because there were some blanks on the papers, and also some verb forms not found in the paradigms.

	Indicative	Subjunctive
Imperfect	1	73
Perfect	3	0
Pluperfect	4	53

Without stopping to look up these cases, most readers will feel the absurdity of assuming that in four books of Caesar there is but one case of purely temporal *cum* with the imperfect tense, and four with the pluperfect, especially as, in this small total, provision must be made for cases of repeated action.

The situation then may be graphically represented as follows:

'Since' Cause	'Though' Concession	'When'	
		Circumstance	Time
1			→
2			→
3			→

In this diagram the first line indicates roughly the point to which the subjunctive actually penetrated into *cum*-clauses of the past in the usage of a writer like Caesar. The second line shows where the theory of the Grammar stops. And the third indicates the usage of the majority of students, who find the Grammar rule a puzzling and perverse guide.

It may not be flattering to face the fact; but it is true, nevertheless, that the old-fashioned rule 'cum-temporal' introduces the subjunctive in the imperfect and pluperfect tenses, the indicative elsewhere' is for nearly all students a far better guide to the usage of Caesar and Cicero than is the new doctrine. Indeed, if the old rule is supplemented by the statement that 'Repeated action calls for the indicative', and the English sentences for translation into Latin are framed with any care, this rule of thumb will be found to work exceedingly well; for at this stage of the work the class in writing need not be troubled by the introduction of the rare and the incidental.

As noted at the beginning of this paper, the makers of Composition books usually help us little at points where the Grammar fails. Moreover, it is far from the ideal to have one rule for reading and another for writing. A heavy responsibility therefore is put upon the makers and revisers of School Grammars to fashion statements that will be a safe guide both for those who read and for those who write.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, California.

H. C. NUTTING.

BOOK REVIEWS

Roman Imperialism. By Tenney Frank. New York: The Macmillan Company (1914). Pp. 365. \$2.50.

Mr. Frank registers a vigorous protest against those historians who must needs apply the subtleties of twentieth century diplomacy to the proceedings of the

bourgeois Senate of ancient Rome and who are afraid that they may be regarded as simpletons if they interpret the simple negotiations of a primitive people in a simple way. It is true that scientific historians have done much in purging the ancient sources of their anachronisms, but they have been only too willing to accept the words of Vergil as the actual inspiration of Rome's foreign policy from Aeneas to Augustus. The modern factors which develop the imperialistic idea in nations, such as innate desire of possession, commercialism, necessity of expansion to provide for surplus population, etc., can not be applied with justice to the early Romans, who were an agricultural people, not thickly settled, possessed of no factories, trade or commerce, a people who in voting for war had not only to tax themselves directly to defray the expenses of the campaign, but must leave the plow to take up the sword. In a period covering many centuries and the changing conditions of the Roman Republic no single formula can be consistently applied.

Under the Republic the governing body at Rome was the Senate, a body powerfully influenced by ancestral tradition, extremely jealous of its authority, and thoroughly permeated with the religious restrictions of the *ius fetiale*, which forbade wars of aggression. As long as the Senate controlled the policies of the state, Rome declared war only when compelled to fight by the aggressiveness of her neighbors. The territory of the enemy was annexed only if it proved necessary to do so in the interests of law and order. Mr. Frank, taking as his text the *ius fetiale*, analyzes the various steps in the expansion of Rome, briefly but clearly setting forth the motives of the dominant parties in the political life of the state and summarizing the local conditions from which the imperialistic idea grew and flourished in democratic surroundings.

The fertile plain of Latium was surrounded by nations not so richly endowed and bound by no conscientious scruples in regard to offensive warfare. By virtue of constant pressure from without Rome developed a power of endurance and an organizing faculty which eventually, when the time for aggressive action came, proved irresistible. When the encroachments of the Volscians were checked, Rome took the offensive, and, after peace was made, she guarded against future attacks by planting Latin colonies in the conquered territory. This policy ultimately proved to be most successful and played an important part in later imperialism. At first, however, expansion was too rapid and the home federation was so severely weakened that it could not withstand the Aequi. The invasion of the Gauls, though utterly draining the resources of the state, proved to be the turning point in Rome's fortunes. Her position on the Tiber, which protected her from the Etruscans, her harbor, and the fact that this was a natural distributing center led to an extraordinary development which speedily gave her the preeminence in the Latin confederacy. The conquest of the Latins was the first step towards

imperialism. The 'oriental idea that the conquerors had a perpetual right to a parasitical life at the expense of the subject people was utterly rejected in favor of a far-seeing liberality by which the disabilities usually entailed by conquest were removed as quickly as possible, and the ultimate bestowal of full citizenship tended to bind the conquerors and the conquered with mutual interests in a united nation.

The Samnite wars brought the Sabellic tribes of Central Italy under the Roman colony system. This addition of territory was strategically necessary to prevent North and South Italy uniting to crush the new imperial power. Samnium was left with territory undiminished but her offensive power was broken by the skilful planting of Roman colonies around her borders.

The next step in imperialism was under the influence of the democratic assemblies. The Senate hesitated to make an alliance with Thurii which it knew would involve Rome in war with Tarentum and would virtually constitute a violation of the *ius fetiale*. The question, however, was taken by the tribune to the plebeian assembly, which now had full legislative powers, and the alliance was enthusiastically voted. The consequences were disastrous, for this action brought on the long and costly wars with Pyrrhus. For some time thereafter the people was content to leave its foreign policy in the hands of the experienced diplomats in the Senate. The First Punic War, however, was brought about by exactly similar circumstances, though we detect the jingoistic element in the deliberations of this young nation only too conscious of the fact that it had thrown back the arms of the greatest general of the time. The reviewer is unable to see why Mr. Frank differentiates this alliance from that with Thurii. Both alliances were made with the certainty that war would follow, and yet the one meant a violation of the *ius fetiale* while the other did not. However expedient it might be for Rome to control the Straits of Messana by concluding this treaty, expediency could hardly be recognized as obviating the obligations of the fetal institution. The occupation of Sardinia after the war shows that any religious scruples which the *ius fetiale* might have caused were by this time easily smoothed over by the plea of military necessity. Whatever the motives which brought Rome into the war, she emerged no longer the leader of a federation but an imperial democracy, for in organizing the new province she adopted the oriental principle that the conquered people were the tenants of the state which owned the soil. Moreover the democratic government in advocating the distribution of lands to the poor at Rome introduced an expensive paternalistic principle which led to far-reaching results in imperialism. The State surrendered its revenue-producing lands within Italy, and in order to recoup itself must extend its tributary domain beyond the bounds of the peninsula.

The analysis of the motives animating the two parties to the Second Punic War is particularly good. Hannibal had no intent to destroy Rome, as is shown by his treaty with Philip of Macedon, nor could he have expected to gain tributary empire in Italy, for the allies of Rome would not leave the federation except upon better terms than they were already enjoying. He could only promise autonomy under Carthage which would have meant nothing more to Carthage than her treaty rights already gave her. Hannibal could have intended nothing else than the humbling of Rome without thought of extermination or conquest. Rome's interests in Spain were solely in defense of the rights of her ally and friend—Massilia. At the close of the war she held Spain, rather to prevent Carthage from using it as a base, than because it was a desirable province. It was far from being so and it was very costly in lives and money. Spain, indeed, is a unique example of the apparent superiority of Punic over Roman imperialism.

Rome's intrusion into the affairs of the East was inspired by sentimental politics in the senatorial group, though I doubt whether the Romans would have been so sentimental, if they had not had a score against Philip of Macedon to even up. The policy of the Scipionic circle, however, was fundamentally anti-imperialistic and precluded forever any idea of expansion beyond the Adriatic. This idealism was opposed by Cato, who brought a reaction to 'practical politics' which, while anti-imperialistic as regards the East, demanded a ready obedience to the wishes of the Senate and put an end to the bickerings and intrigues of the petty Greek States.

In the half-century following the Second Macedonian war internal politics precluded any settled foreign policy. The establishment of a province in Macedonia after the defeat of the pretender seems to have sprung from nothing else than a desire for possession. The treatment of Greece proper, even after Mummius had destroyed Corinth, was quite different. Apparently the imposition of tribute on Greece was repugnant even to the practical politicians, and they were too practical to govern this poverty stricken land *gratis*. Rome's dealings with Carthage, if not violating the *ius fetiale* in encouraging Masinissa, were characterized by a "slimness" and injustice even greater than that meted out to the Spanish tribes. The conviction of supreme power marked a sharp decline in the moral tone of Roman diplomacy.

The bequest of Attalus gave Rome a foothold in Asia and the Gracchan legislation paved the way for further expansion in that it directly attached the business interests to this policy. The addition of new rich provinces in the East gave them greater territory for exploitation. Commercialism, which is so dominant a factor in modern imperialism, found no place in Roman diplomacy until the age of the Gracchi.

The Senate desired to govern with as little expenditure of blood and money as possible. Triumph-

hunting or the possibility of a commander becoming too prominent by success in war was not encouraged by the Senate. The disposition of Numidia after the war with Jugurtha shows its indifference to expansion. A clearer case is found in its attitude to Mithradates, whose aggressive tactics merely brought diplomatic protests for a long time. After Sulla was finally sent against him and defeated the Pontic forces, no territory was taken from the king save the province which he had wrested from Rome. Nor did Lucullus, in the second campaign against Mithradates, extend the Empire, though it is apparent that he intended to add Mithradates's kingdom to the newly inherited Bithynia and create one province. Yet Syria was given back to Antiochus. Lucullus brought on his head the wrath of the equites or commercial party in Rome by his cancellation of two-thirds of the public debts and his regulation of interest charges, and by reforming other abuses of the tax-collectors. So great an outcry was raised that he was recalled and the capitalists secured the appointment of Pompey in the hope of speedily ending the war and giving the shareholders of the tithe-farming syndicates a chance to recoup their losses. The chameleon Pompey—now the agent of the equestrian order—became an expansionist and his campaigns brought new provinces and six-fold tribute. While never violating the fetial law by taking the aggressive, his interpretation of the rules was most liberal and the theory that conquest gave possession was rigidly upheld.

Caesar was the first candid imperialist of Rome and his Gallic campaign is the clearest instance of purely aggressive expansion in the history of the Republic. His attitude towards the conquered people was that of the early Roman statesman. They were not revenue-producing subjects but possible candidates for full Roman citizenship. It is clear, however, that he regarded Gaul as a stepping stone to imperial power—a good field for military training and a splendid recruiting ground for his legions.

This summary of Mr. Frank's book can give but an approximation of its merits. It needs to be read *in toto* to be appreciated. Very occasionally we feel that the writer turns a blind eye or mayhap winks at Roman aggression, yet his keen analyses of the politics which led to the various steps in expansion are more often convincing than not. The book fills a gap in the field of Roman History and fills it exceedingly well.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

CAESAR IN THE SECOND YEAR

The objection to the use of Caesar in the second year seems to rest very largely upon the assumption that Caesar can be handled there only in the familiar traditional fashion. This, of course, is far from being true. Already schools here and there are adopting the very sensible plan of devoting a year and a half

to 'beginning Latin', a large part of the added time being given to the reading of a graded text.

Under this régime the student does not undertake Caesar until he has developed some real power to read the language. Actual experiment is showing that students thus trained can cover three or four books of Caesar in a single half-year, and with a real appreciation of what they are reading.

If, in addition to this, the teacher is wise enough to discard the fetish of Gallic War I-IV and to select the material from the whole range of Caesar, most of the objections to the use of that author in the second year will be fully met.

For it surely is a mistake, too, to suppose that only a teacher who is a genius can handle Caesar successfully in the second year, and that a very expensive apparatus is essential to good work. The most valuable help for the teacher of Caesar is a first-hand knowledge of the writings of Caesar and his continuators. This help any teacher can have who is willing to set aside the time for it. It is much to be feared that many people are trying to teach Caesar who have hardly glanced at the Civil War, to say nothing of the Bellum Alexandrinum or the Bellum Africum.

It would be an excellent thing if, in every University and College where teachers of Latin are trained, there should be offered a course in Caesar and his continuators in which the student should be required to become really acquainted with the text in the large. The story that Caesar and his staff officers tell is one of compelling interest and replete with striking incidents—an electric storm, the devices by which the enemy polluted the Nile-fed cisterns at Alexandria, the assassination of Pompey, the commander-in-chief forced to swim for his life, elephants in training for battle, and many other things. Personal experience with such a class shows how much such work is needed and what a change it produces in the attitude of mind of the prospective teacher.

If the High School teacher really knows his subject and has himself caught something of the inspiration of the theme, it will not require any artificial stimulus to make Caesar live, especially if, as suggested above, his class has been fully prepared before undertaking to read Caesar.

As a matter of fact we have not yet really given Caesar a fair trial under present-day conditions. If, after giving him a fair trial, we are unable to maintain his claim to at least a part of the second year, it will be time enough then to face the discouraging problem of finding a substitute.

To the scholar who knows the language well it may seem an easy task to pick out material suitable for second year reading; but the fact has proved to be just the reverse. The so-called easy Latin which we hear so much about usually proves more difficult for the student than does Caesar himself; and, if the Latin is really easy, there is apt to be something wrong with the subject-matter. After an excursion we usually

come circling back again, ready to give at least a part of the second year to Caesar.

Aside from the intrinsic merit of Caesar, there are various other considerations that make a sweeping change in the reading of the second year undesirable. Caesar has held the field so long that he enjoys a prestige that can never be taken over by a collection of miscellaneous readings from which he is excluded. And about Caesar there has grown up a very valuable and extensive body of helps, very little of which could be transferred with advantage to another field. It may prove ultimately that a sweeping change must be made in the reading of the second year; but it would be well to make sure that we are right before undertaking such an innovation.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, California.

H. C. NUTTING.

CUNAXA AND CTESIPHON

One who is teaching the annals of warfare found in the Gallic War of Caesar and in the *Anabasis* of Xenophon (as to the interest of these works I agree with Professor Dennison and Dr. Radin, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 9.81-82, 134-135), may find a wealth of material to illustrate them, by following the daily papers in their accounts of the World War; see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.42-43, 69-70, 73-74, 89-90, 96, 97-98, 128, 136, 168, 208, 216; 9.24.

To this impressive array another item may be added, in the form of the following Associated Press Correspondence, dated London, January 31, and clipped from the Philadelphia Press of February 14:

The remarkable stand which has been made by Major General Charles V. F. Townshend and his comparatively small body of British troops at Kut-el-Amara, Mesopotamia, where for nearly two months they have been besieged by a large army of Turks, has raised General Townshend to a high place in the esteem of the English public. This far-away war theater has been watched with the deepest interest by those at home since the British repulsed the Turks at Ctesiphon and began their retreat to Kut. . . .

The conflict at Ctesiphon was desperate work and the general himself fought as fiercely as any of his soldiers, who that day put to flight a body of Ottoman troops said to have been six times their number. There were critical moments, and it was at these times that General Townshend showed himself to be a cool and resourceful commander and an able tactician. Four times he rallied his men and led them in their charges.

Military critics declare that the victory at Ctesiphon was a magnificent one, but that the retreat to Kut will equal if not surpass it as a successful military achievement under disadvantages of an extraordinary kind. It is stated that not only did General Townshend ward off the Turks, but he did so with a loss insignificant under the circumstances, and he succeeded in taking with him all his wounded. . . .

What a splendid parallel to the *Anabasis* of Xenophon! Yet with differences: Cyrus entered the country from the west, and advanced down the Euphrates; Townshend entered from the east, and ad-

vanced up the Tigris; Cyrus was slain in the critical battle, but the commander of the Anglo-Indian forces survived the conflict.

But otherwise there is a great similarity. Both invasions were made in the face of superior numbers, with a small body of European troops assisted by relatively large forces of Asiatics (Greeks and Persians of old, British and Hindus to-day). The important battles (Cunaxa and Ctesiphon) were fought alongside great rivers (Euphrates and Tigris), within a few miles of the great cities which were the objectives of the campaigns (Babylon and Bagdad), all in one small section of the country. Cyrus's victory was a virtual defeat, because of his own death; Townshend suffered defeat, but with slight loss of men. Both generals took active part in person in the fighting. After the battle, we must set Xenophon in Cyrus's place as the counterpart to Townshend: then we have the masterly retreat amongst swarming enemies, who up to the time of writing seem not to have accomplished much against their inferior foe.

One final point of difference, lest an injustice be done: the Persian troops of Cyrus deserted to the Great King after the battle, but no such traitorous conduct on the part of the Hindu soldiery has taken place in the present campaign. The resemblances are still sufficiently striking to lend an added zest to the reading of the adventures of the immortal Ten Thousand.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

THE WASHINGTON CLASSICAL CLUB

The Washington Classical Club held a meeting at the Colonial School, on the afternoon of Saturday, February 19. Professor Charles Knapp, of Barnard College, delivered an address on The Teacher's Study of Vergil.

In earnest and inspiring words Professor Knapp urged upon teachers the necessity of possessing a much broader knowledge of the subject than that actually in use in the class-room. He suggested the reading of biographies of Vergil written by Romans, as well as the works of the great modern authorities, Sellar, Glover, Nettleship, etc. He insisted upon a study of the syntax and the root meaning of the Latin words and a translation which would render this accurately and not obscure the figures involved in the original.

Professor Knapp, by precept and the example of his own exquisite reading of the lines, made teachers see the necessity of practice in the art of reading aloud the Latin original. He said that the teacher who feels that he is tired of teaching the same author year after year should pause a while, to search carefully his own spirit. He should, by constant study of Latin and of life, render himself a new man with power to view the subject from a new angle each year; if he does that, he will not find the teaching of it from year to year monotonous.

H. MAY JOHNSON,
Corresponding Secretary.

Publications by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States

A PAMPHLET OF 40 PAGES (exclusive of the covers), ENTITLED

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF LATIN

Expressions by lawyers, physicians, journalists, engineers, scientists, educators and business men favorable to the Classics, as subjects having a direct meaning and use for those who plan to engage in various forms of so-called practical life. A pamphlet suitable for distribution among High School or Preparatory School pupils and among College students as well.

12 copies, -	\$.50	100 Copies, -	\$ 3.50
25 "	1.00	160 "	5.00
50 "	1.90	Larger quantities may be had at even lower rates	

ADDRESS

CHARLES KNAPP

Barnard College

NEW YORK CITY

THE HINTS

To bridge the gap between the technical language of the Grammar and the "instant need" of the class room, **Barss's Writing Latin, Books I and II**, have paragraphs called **Hints**. Teachers and students have said that they were good. Here is a specimen from the new Book II, Lesson I:

"Indirect Object. Remember that while in English the indirect object may be made the subject of the passive, this must never be done in writing Latin. Only the direct object of the active can become the subject of the passive, the indirect object remaining in the dative; so that such a sentence as

'The soldiers were given money', will, in Latin, always take the form, 'Money was given to the soldiers, *Pecunia militibus data est*'".

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

New Volume

Lingua Latina Series

Edited by W. H. D. ROUSE and S. O. ANDREW

RÈGÈS CONSULSQUE RÖMÀNI. By F. R. DALE. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. 84. \$.50
The materials consist of stories taken from the first books of Livy.

A FIRST LATIN GRAMMAR for Schools. By E. A. SONNENSCHEIN. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. 126. \$.40

This book will meet all the needs of the beginner, the subject of formal syntax being reserved for a later stage of study.

A LATIN SYNTAX for Schools. By E. A. SONNENSCHEIN. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. 168. \$.40
To be used after a First Latin Grammar.

OUTLINES OF GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY TO A.D. 180. By M. A. HAMILTON. Second edition, enlarged. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. 194, with six illustrations and five maps. \$.75

CAESAR'S GALlic WAR. A Vocabulary compiled by G. G. LOANE. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. 62. \$.40

THE OXFORD LATIN COURSE. Part I. From the Elements to the Text of Caesar's Campaigns in Britain. Modified to avoid the use of the subjunctive mood. By R. L. A. DUPONTET. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. xvi + 302, 60

"This is a book with a single aim: to enable you in the shortest possible time to read a Latin author, and read him accurately".

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH, 35 West 32nd Street, NEW YORK

W. F. HUMPHREY

300-312 Pulteney St. GENEVA, N. Y.

BOOK, CATALOG, MAGAZINE AND BOOKLET PRINTING

Special attention given to technical and scientific publications and pamphlets

THE COMPLETE PLANT
ESTABLISHED 1885

ARGUING WITH BOB

(Third Edition)

A Pamphlet of 12 pages on the value of Latin
(Third edition)

Issued by

The Classical Association of the
Middle West and South

Copies, 1 cent each; 25 for 20 cents; 100 for 70 cents.

Address: PUBLICITY COMMITTEE,
11 Hall of Liberal Arts, Iowa City, Iowa

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 120th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership in The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. To institutions in this territory, the subscription price is one dollar per year. Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. If affidavit to bill for subscription is required, the fee must be paid by the subscriber. Subscribers in Canada or other foreign countries must send 30 cents extra for postage.

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

CHARLES E. BENNETT, Cornell University
WALTER DENNISON, Swarthmore College
WALTON B. Mc DANIEL, University of Pennsylvania
DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University
B. L. ULLMAN, University of Pittsburgh
H. H. YEAMES, Hobart College

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York City.

Single copies, 10 cents. Extra numbers, 10 cents each. \$1.00 per dozen.

Printed by W. F. Humphrey, 300 Pulteney St., Geneva, N. Y.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION
OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

Organized in November, 1906

Membership April 30, 1915—704

Dues \$2.00 per annum
(The year runs from May 1 to April 30)

President

PROFESSOR WALTER DENNISON
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pa.

Secretary-Treasurer

PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP
Barnard College, New York City

Vice-Presidents

Professor Herbert H. Yeames, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.

Professor Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Mr. Charles Breed, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

Miss M. K. McNiff, Harrisburg, Pa.

Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Professor Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del.

Miss Margaret Garrett, Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.

Professor Charles S. Smith, George Washington University, D. of C.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SUMMER SESSION

JULY 10—AUGUST 18, 1916

GREEK—

Elementary Course	Professor Macurdy
Xenophon, <i>Anabasis</i>	Professor Knapp
Homer, <i>Iliad</i>	Professor Sturtevant
Aristophanes	Professor Macurdy

LATIN—

Elementary Course	Mr. Demarest (for beginners)
Elementary Course, by Direct Method	Miss Wye
Caesar	Professor Gummere (= Entrance Latin 3)
Vergil, Selections from <i>Aeneid</i> I-VI	Mr. Demarest (= Entrance Latin 5)
Cicero	Mr. Messer (= Entrance Latin 4)
Prose Composition	Mr. Messer (= Entrance Latin 6)

LATIN—(Continued)

Livy	Professor Sturtevant (= Latin A1)
Horace, Catullus	Professor Gummere
Prose Composition—College Course	Professor Knapp
Prose Composition—Advanced College Course	Professor Moore
Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> —Advanced Course	Professor McCrea
Lucretius	Professor McCrea
Lyric and Elegiac Poetry	Professor Moore
Latin Conversation	Miss Wye